DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT 3

(July 27, 2020 Letter from S. Buergel to D. Jeffries)

Case 1:19-cv-10256-GHW Document 75-4 Filed 09/29/20 Page 2 of 5

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K. GARRISON (1946-1991)
RANDOLPH E. PAUL (1946-1956)
SIMON H. RIFKIND (1950-1995)
LOUIS S. WEISS (1927-1950)
JOHN F. WHARTON (1927-1977)

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(212) 373-3553

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

(212) 492-0553

writer's direct e-mail address sbuergel@paulweiss.com

July 27, 2020

UNIT 5201, FORTUNE FINANCIAL CENTER 5 DONGSANHUAN ZHONGLU CHAOYANG DISTRICT, BEIJING 100020, CHINA TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828-6300

HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING, 12TH FLOOR
3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL
HONG KONG
TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

ALDER CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EC2V 7JU, UNITED KINGDOM TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE
77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100
PO. BOX 226
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3
TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

2001 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047 TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410 MATTHEW W. ABBOTT
EDWARD T. ACKERMAN
JACOB A. ADLERSTEIN
JACOB A. ARTHOR
ROBERT A. ATKINS
DAVID J. BALL
SCOTT A. BARSHAY
PAUL M. BASTAG
JONATHAN
JACOB B. BASTAG
JONATHAN
JACOB B. BASTAG
JONATHAN
JACOB B. BASTAG
JOSEPH J. BIAL
BRUCE BIRENBUM
JANID M. BERNICK
JOSEPH J. BIAL
BRUCE BIRENBUM
H. GHRISTOFHER
BOCHNING
ROBERT BRITTON
DAVID W. BROWN
JAVID W. BROWN
SUSANNA M. BUERGEL
JESSICA S. CAREY
DAVID CARMONA
BUERGEL
JESSICA S. CAREY
DAVID CARMONA
GOFFREY
JAY CHEN
WILLIAM A. CLAREMAN
LEWIS R. CLAYTON
YAHONNES CLEARY
JAY CHEN
YACHAEL G. COFFEY
JAY CHEN
CHRISTOPHER J. CUMMINGS
THOMAS V. DE LA BASTIDE III
ARIEL J. DECKELBAUM
KAREN L. DUNN
ALICE BELISLE EATON
ANDREW J. FERLICH
GREGOR', E. ZING
ROBERTO FINZI
PETER E. FISCH
HARRIS J. FINKELSTEIN
BRIAN P. FINNEGAN
ROBERTO FINZI
PETER E. FISCH
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS B. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
MANUEL S. FREY
ANDREW J. FORMAN*
HARRIS J. FREIDUS
CHRISTOPHER D. FREY
HARRIS J. FREIDUS
CHRIS

oury 27, 2020

*NOT ADMITTED TO THE NEW YORK BAR

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

David Jeffries, Esq. 1345 Avenue of the Americas, 33rd Floor New York, NY 10105

Cardwell v. Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP, et al. (1:19-cv-10256-GHW)

Dear David:

We write regarding the July 18, 2020 document production made by plaintiff (the "Production") in the above-captioned action.

Despite the Court's July 7, 2020 order that plaintiff "provide complete responses to all pending discovery requests no later than July 18, 2020," plaintiff's Production, and plaintiff's responses to defendants' interrogatories, are critically deficient. ECF 60.

Among other things, Mr. Cardwell has failed to produce, in whole or in part, documents known to be responsive and in his possession, custody, or control. He has selectively produced portions of responsive messaging chains, by photographing certain communications and concealing others. He has omitted attachments from responsive

messages. He has failed to produce messages from communication and media platforms he admits to using. He has selectively redacted responsive and nonprivileged content from communications, including names of those with whom he was communicating. He has failed to produce any communications (email, text messages, social media communications) with several individuals identified at Interrogatory Nos. 6, 7, or 8, notwithstanding that communications with such individuals would plainly be responsive.

These issues belie any claim as to the sufficiency of the Production, and suggest a failure to conduct a good-faith collection or review for responsiveness of materials in plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff's failures continue to deprive defendants of information to which they are entitled, and that is critical to the claims and defenses in this action.

Defendants request that plaintiff's counsel be prepared to meet and confer about each of these topics this afternoon or tomorrow morning, in advance of the Court conference scheduled for 1:00 on Tuesday, July 28, 2020. If plaintiff fails promptly to cure the deficiencies above, defendants will have no choice but to inform the Court of plaintiff's continuing failure to abide by his discovery obligations.

The following are examples of deficiencies in plaintiff's production. This list, and these examples, are not exclusive.

- Plaintiff has improperly redacted responsive content, see, e.g., CARDWELL000514; CARDWELL000540; CARDWELL000570, sometimes entirely, see CARDWELL001179
- Plaintiff has failed to produce full document families, including from personal email accounts. See, e.g., CARDWELL00052; CARDWELL000521 (no attachment); CARDWELL000580 (same); CARDWELL000695; CARDWELL000708; CARDWELL001440; CARDWELL001753; CARDWELL000675; CARDWELL000680.
- Plaintiff has produced only selective screenshots of responsive text- and social media message chains. See, e.g., CARDWELL001225; CARDWELL001246; CARDWELL002062, CARDWELL002063, CARDWELL002070, CARDWELL002076. Plaintiff must extract and have counsel review for responsiveness all text message, email, and social media chains believed to contain potentially responsive material; plaintiff may not cherry-pick the responsive messages he wishes to produce.
- **Plaintiff has failed to produce text messages** with any of the individuals identified at Interrogatory Nos. 6, 7, or 8.
- Plaintiff directed his contacts to use the communications platform Signal, CARDWELL000675, but has failed to produce responsive Signal messages.

- Plaintiff has improperly redacted the names of his correspondents in social media communications. See CARDWELL002035 through CARDWELL002088.
- Scanned pages are cut off throughout the production, obscuring text. See, e.g., CARDWELL000046; CARDWELL000062; CARDWELL000266.
- Certain documents were only partially printed and produced. See, e.g., CARDWELL000530.
- Certain documents have no content. See, e.g., CARDWELL001520; CARDWELL001521.
- Plaintiff failed to produce documents on which he relied in drafting his complaint and that are thus known to be in his possession, custody, or control, calling into question the thoroughness of the remainder of the production.¹ For example, plaintiff has produced a series of reviews attached to defendants' NYSDHR position statement, see, e.g., CARDWELL002012 through CARDWELL002033, but has failed to produce other related documents known to be in his possession (because he relied upon them in his complaint), calling into question the remainder of the production.

Plaintiff's interrogatory responses are similarly deficient. Plaintiff has refused, without basis, to identify the "email addresses and social media accounts (including account names) used or controlled" by him during the relevant period, despite having conceded that he used such accounts to exchange responsive communications, and despite having produced communications for a handle—"Dr. Umar Johnson"—used by plaintiff and not previously disclosed in this litigation. Interrogatory Response No. 13.

He has refused to answer a number of defendants' interrogatories, asserting that his inability to "understanding how this Interrogatory relates to the claims or defenses asserted in this action" is a basis upon which to decline to respond pending further "determination" by the parties. *See, e.g.*, Interrogatory Response Nos. 11, 14, 15.

He has refused, without basis, to identify those with knowledge of any alleged "impairment to his name and reputation," pending an "attempt to clarify" and "narrow" the Interrogatory. Interrogatory Response No. 5.

Plaintiff's production proves that his claim, in his recent submission to the Court, that he has not received a copy of defendants' submission to the NYSDHR, is false; plaintiff's production includes, at CARDWELL002012 through CARDWELL002033, the reviews submitted by Davis Polk to the NYSDHR in December 2017, all of which bear the FOIL ledger applied by the Firm for purposes of that submission.

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP David Jeffries, Esq.

4

He has refused to respond to defendants' request for a "computation of all categories of damages" sought by plaintiff. Interrogatory Response No. 10.

He has failed to seek, at any time prior to or following the Court's July 18 deadline, a meet and confer with defendants on any of the topics referenced above.

Defendants are available to meet and confer about these issues anytime today or tomorrow morning, in advance of tomorrow's Court conference. Defendants further demand that plaintiff cure all failures to comply with the Court's July 7, 2020 order not later than August 3, 2020.

Defendants reserve all rights, including to take any and all steps to address the above deficiencies or others arising out of further review of the responses or additional information discovered through the meet and confer process or otherwise.

Sincerely,

/s/ Susanna Buergel

Susanna Buergel